1	FINAL  MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  Wednesday, June 4, 2008 7:00 p.m. Cottonwood Heights City Council Room 1265 East Fort Union Boulevard, Suite 300	
2		
3 4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10	Cottonw	ood Heights, Utah
11		
12	ATTENDANCE	
13	ATTENDANCE	
14	Planning Commission Mombors	City Staff.
15 16	Planning Commission Members:	City Staff:
17	Gordon Nicholl, Chairman	Michael Black, Planning Director
18	Geoff Armstrong	Greg Platt, City Planner
19	Perry Bolyard, Alternate	Shane Topham, City Attorney
20	J. Thomas Bowen	Morgan Brim, Planning Technician
21	JoAnn Frost	Brad Gilson, City Engineer
22	Jerri Harwell, Alternate	
23	Doug Haymore	
24	Jim Keane	
25	Amy Rosevear	
26		
27	BUSINESS MEETING	
28	Chairman Cardon Nighall called the man	ting to order at 7:04 mm. Proceedings issues were
29 30		
31	reviewed.	
32	1. WELCOME/ACKNOWLEDGEN	MENTS.
33	THE CONTENT OF THE CO	<u> </u>
34	Chair Nicholl welcomed those present and acknowledged the presence of Scout Troop 836.	
35	1	
36	2. <u>CITIZEN COMMENTS.</u>	
37		
38	Chair Nicholl stated that this item was to hear public comments from the citizens to the Planning	
39	Commission on issues that are not on the ag	genda. There were no citizen comments.
40	A DIDITION OF THE LEGISLA	
41	3. <u>PUBLIC HEARINGS.</u>	
42	No public hearings were scheduled	
43 44	No public hearings were scheduled.	
-T-T		

### 4. ACTION ITEMS.

4.1 The Planning Commission will take action on a request by Scott McDonald for a Conditional Use Request for an 11,800 square foot office/retail space in one new building located at 6700 South Highland Drive and 6710 South Blackstone Road, also known as Blackstone Crossing.

(19:06:33) City Planner, Greg Platt, presented the staff report and reviewed the staff conditions set out in the staff report. Staff recommended approval subject to the conditions.

Commissioner Bowen asked what a reasonable time period would be for construction of the project. Valerie Wallace of Wadsworth Construction gave their address as 166 East 14000 South. She stated that construction would take six months from the time the permit is obtained. Construction hours are normally 7:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Commissioner Bowen had concerns with the 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. construction times, particularly in light of the fact that the City will be dealing with that issue later on in the meeting. He was confident that those hours would change. He suggested more reasonable hours be established. He thought 7:00 a.m. was too early to begin and 9:00 p.m. was too late to finish. It was thought that starting work earlier in the day prevents workers from having to work in very hot temperatures. Commissioner Armstrong thought it was reasonable for construction to begin at 7:00 a.m. He agreed that 9:00 p.m. was too late to finish.

Commissioner Bowen stated that there was some discussion about not putting in the fence and instead putting in boulders and landscaping. He understood that UDOT would have to sign off on it. He asked the applicant if he would be opposed to landscaping rather than fencing. The applicant, Scott McDonald, gave his address as 7878 Tynedale Court. He explained that when they negotiated the purchase of the property, UDOT was very particular about making sure that the fence was up so that cars won't go from Blackstone onto the freeway. Commissioner Bowen's idea was to install landscaping and berming with big boulders, which would accomplish the same thing but look much better than a fence. Mr. McDonald agreed but stated that there was a significant distance between the building and the parking and the fence. He commented that because it is so far from the building, the fencing will most likely not be noticed. The proposed fencing would be a four to five-foot chain link fence.

(19:15:20) Planning Director, Michael Black, commented that chain link fencing is not allowed on new projects. He stated that the issue would need to be addressed with UDOT. Commissioner Bowen reported that there is a chain link fence near his office on North Union Avenue that is four to five feet tall. There is routinely a hole in it where someone has driven through it. Ultimately, boulders were placed in front of the chain link fence. It was suggested that UDOT put the fence on their property and move it over, as they own that section. Mr. Black reiterated that chain link fences would not be approved as part of the project.

Mr. McDonald stated that he would work with UDOT to resolve the fencing issue. He reminded the Commission of the previous discussion that they may be working into the winter on landscaping and may have to bond to complete the project. He did not recall this issue being listed in the previous minutes. He also noted that the doors on the west side of the building will be solid metal; therefore, blinds would be put on the window portion and not necessarily the solid door portion. Mr. Black noted that the doors were shown as glass in the plans. Ms.

- Wallace confirmed that a solid door was planned. Mr. McDonald explained that for security 1 purposes, a solid door was preferable to glass on that side of the building. Commissioner 2
- Harwell inquired as to why doors were needed on that side of the building. Mr. McDonald 3
- 4 explained that it would serve as a delivery entrance. Concern was raised about the aesthetics of
- that side of the building. 5

6

- Mr. McDonald assured the Commissioners that the attractive windows on the second floor would 7
- enhance the look of the building. Mr. Black was concerned that the plans show glass doors. 8
- Commissioner Frost was concerned that the majority of traffic viewing the building will be from 9
- the west side, driving on Highland Drive. The east side of the building will have more privacy. 10
- She was more concerned about the aesthetics from Highland Drive. Her preference would be 11
- glass. Commissioner Haymore suggested there be some visual enhancement of the metal doors. 12

13

Signage issues were discussed and signage locations were specified. Mr. McDonald clarified 14 that the signs would be on the east and west sides of the building only. 15

16 17

(19:24:24) Commissioner Bowen moved to approve Application Number 08-003, subject to the following conditions:

18 19 20

21

1 All construction shall take place in accordance with the approved plans for this development. Any changes to the plans will be required to receive the appropriate approvals.

22 23

All landscaping in the development shall be completed before final certificate of 24 2 occupancy is granted (19.80.080(G)). If the landscaping cannot be completed, an 25 appropriate bond shall be posted with the City. 26

27

28 *3*. All pedestrian walkways shall be lighted (19.80.090(3)).

29

4. 30 All lights in the development shall be full-cut off (19.80.090(4)).

31

Developer shall provide walkways through the center island on east side of the parking 32 *5*. lot for pedestrian access to the sidewalk. 33

34

No new tree in the development shall be less than two-inch caliper at the time of 35 6. 36 planting.

37

38 *7*. Construction for the project shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM daily to preserve the integrity of the adjacent neighborhoods. 39

40

41 8. The use of the property shall be limited to office, business, and/or professional, 42 medical, optical or dental offices or laboratories, and general retail.

43

44 9. The developer shall provide a plan for screening of mechanical equipment for staff review and subject to staff approval or rejection. 45

46

Street lighting will be provided by developer along City streets as indicated on the plat. 47 *10*.

.

the project. If the issue cannot be resolved, it shall be resolved by staff.

Engineering:

1. Please provide a geotechnical report for the proposed development.

## Fire Department

1. This project requires the installation of two new hydrants and must be installed prior to the delivery of combustible materials to the job site. Siting of hydrants as indicated on reviewed plat.

The developer shall work with the City and UDOT on the issue of the fence and obtain permission to do something in the alternative, such as placing boulders or other items

that would prevent the traffic exiting off of Blackstone from entering onto the access to

Approved lock box required on exterior door to sprinkler riser room and by each business as numbered on the reviewed plat.

3. Building must have an automatic fire sprinkler system.

ARC:

1. The wall around the trash receptacle should be faced with sandstone to the top with a sandstone or metal cap in order to match the building façade.

27 2. All the windows on the same side of the building should be of the same color, and preferably, all windows on the building should match.

30 3. Signs should be limited to one sign per tenant per side of the building, totaling two signs per tenant. Signs should be on the east and west sides of the building only.

4. Landscaping should include a minimum of three trees on the southwest corner of the lot to screen the stairs. As many as five columnar evergreen trees may be required, which will be determined by an on-site review after construction is completed.

5. Doors and windows on the west side of the building adjacent to Highland Dr. and I-215 shall be glass and equipped with blinds for screening from the street.

**6.** Parking on Blackstone Road should be discouraged for retail consumers and not allowed for deliveries.

- 43 Commissioner Armstrong seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Gordon Nicholl-Aye, Geoff
- 44 Armstrong-Aye, Perry Bolyard-Aye, J. Thomas Bowen-Aye, JoAnn Frost-Aye, Jerri Harwell-
- 45 Aye, Doug Haymore-Aye, Jim Keane-Aye, Amy Rosevear-Aye. The motion passed

46 unanimously.

## 

## 5. <u>DISCUSSION ITEMS.</u>

(19:27:12) Chair Nicholl suspended the agenda and opened item 5.2 for public comment.

# 5.2 The Planning Commission will discuss the proposed amendments to Chapter 19.76, Supplementary and Qualifying Regulations.

Rita Stone was present representing her husband Bennett Stone of 7610 Michelle Way. Together they are the owners of .6-acre of property and had contemplated building a second home behind their existing home. Their grandchildren were willing and able to take care of them on their property when the time comes so they won't have to go into a nursing home. Mrs. Stone commented that they currently winter in Arizona, but were planning for the future when they no longer will be able to do that. The current City regulations allow a second building to be only 25% of the existing home, which is not enough space for them. Their preference would be to build a home larger than the allowed 750 square feet, particularly to allow for wheelchair access. She was also concerned that the ordinance does not allow for permanent occupancy.

Chair Nicholl agreed that those were some considerations to think about when revising section 19.76. Mr. Black reported that the zoning in the area is RR-1-21. The Stones would have the option to build a guest home, which could be done without subdividing the property. Under the new code, the maximum size of the guesthouse can be no greater than 25% of the main house. In the Stone's case, the guesthouse can be no greater than 750-square feet. Mrs. Stone wanted to have the ability to live on her property full-time, which would be considered an accessory living structure rather than a guesthouse. Mr. Black was aware of at least one City Council Member who is against accessory living structures because his neighborhood has a lot of them that are illegal. Mr. Black commented that accessory living structures and guesthouses would be discussed at a future date with respect to affordable housing.

(19:31:10) Mr. Black referred to a home on Creek Road where a resident has over one acre of property and has built a large garage with a guesthouse on top. He explained that it sometimes becomes enticing to use a guesthouse that is too large as a permanent residence. Commissioner Armstrong clarified that the current proposed limit is 25% of the main house excluding the garage. Commissioner Bowen commented that basing the size of the guesthouse on the lot size penalizes those who do not go border-to-border on their property. Mr. Black stated that one alternative could be to limit it to no more than a specific percentage of the rear yard.

It made sense to one Commission Member to limit guesthouses based on the size of the home. It was noted that guesthouses are intended to be occupied for a short period of time. Mr. Black noted that the size of the house could be increased, thereby making the allowed guesthouse size proportionately larger.

(19:34:20) Commissioner Frost stated that the height restrictions for a guesthouse should remain and they should not be taller than the main home. She suggested increasing the size to a 25% portion of the backyard, as allowed in the current building code for structures such as detached garages. Chair Nicholl added that the challenge is that if the rear yard is large, the guesthouse

may be larger than the front house. Mr. Black clarified that rear yards are meant for gardens, RV buildings, and sheds. The issue of having an additional home on the site is not addressed. Because of its unique purpose, a different standard for guesthouse requirements is appropriate. Chair Nicholl was concerned that the one-story height limitation would prevent guest quarters on top of a garage, which is a typical configuration.

1 2

It was noted that that if the garage houses an RV, a guesthouse could be developed on the second floor. Mr. Black clarified that in the Rural Residential zone, the maximum height for an accessory structure is the same as for the main structure, so long as the setbacks are met. In the R-1-8, R-1-10, and R-1-15 zones, the maximum height is 20 feet. Commissioner Bowen suggested that the request made by the Stones be addressed in more detail. It was suggested that staff compare what is being done currently in the City to what other cities are doing. It was recognized that there is already a problem with short-term rentals in the City. Size restrictions on the guesthouses should remain in place to prevent other problems from arising.

The Planning Commission will discuss the proposed amendments to the Foothill Recreation Zone F-20; Foothill Residential Zone F-1-43; Foothill Residential Zone F-1-21; Rural Residential Zone RR-1-43; Rural Residential Zone RR-1-21; Residential Single-Family Zone R-1-10; Residential Single-Family Zone R-1-8; Residential Single-Family Zone R-1-6 zoning amendment. Modifying setbacks for accessory structures and re-evaluating adopted list of permitted and conditional uses.

(19:37:44) Mr. Black began the discussion with the F-20 zone. He noted that there are currently no permitted uses in the F-20 zone, not even single-family dwellings. He read the proposed uses allowed in the F-20 zone. In response to a question raised, Mr. Black explained that the term "household pet" refers to dogs, cats, or other animals that can be constrained. Large animals including cows and horses would not be permitted. Chair Nicholl asked that F-20 zones in the City be identified. Mr. Black responded that almost all of Larry Walker's property is zoned F-20. The Commission Members had no objection to the F-20 uses as proposed. PUD issues were discussed. Mr. Black explained that the planned unit development (PUD) language allows for a cluster of homes.

(19:40:33) Mr. Black then discussed the F-1-43 zone. He explained that much of the property is behind the homes that front Top of the World Drive. Those were the last homes in the City going east. Permitted uses were identified as single-family dwellings, home occupations, household pets, and accessory buildings that are customary to a single-family use, such as a garage. Proposed conditional uses would include agriculture, bed and breakfast facilities, churches, daycare and preschool facilities, home daycare, public and quasi-public uses, radio and TV towers, temporary structures, and wireless telecommunications. He noted that daycare and preschool uses do not need to be included, as the area is not commercial. He remarked that home daycare would be appropriate in the area. A Commission Member added that home daycare is a home occupation and, therefore, does not need to be listed separately. Mr. Black suggested moving all home occupations to conditional uses, as most are approved at staff level.

 The appropriateness of bed and breakfasts in the area were discussed. Mr. Black agreed that that was an appropriate use. Commissioner Keane remarked that he would not want a bed and breakfast in his neighborhood. Commissioner Armstrong commented that a bed and breakfast use, while not desirable, is preferable to a ski rental. Bed and breakfasts within the City were identified. It was suggested that bed and breakfast applicants request an amendment before the Commission. Another Commission Member agreed. She wanted to remove the bed and breakfast use and added that enforcement would be an issue. The Commission Members agreed to remove the bed and breakfast use. It was determined that the remaining uses not related to residential were acceptable.

1 2

(19:44:57) The F-1-21 zone was discussed. Permitted uses would include single-family detached dwellings and household pets in non-watershed areas. Mr. Black stated that he would make a note to change home occupation to a conditional use. The Commission Members had no objection. Mr. Black then reported that conditional uses would include agriculture and churches. The golf course use was removed as there was no room for a golf course in the area. Home daycare was removed as it was a part of home occupations that were discussed previously. Other uses were described as planned unit developments (PUD), public/quasi-public uses, radio/TV towers, temporary structures, water pumping plants and reservoirs, wireless telecommunications, and utility stations and lines. A comment was made about an additional water tower in the area and whether it would be buried. Mr. Black confirmed that all new water towers are buried.

(19:47:16) The RR-1-43 zone was discussed. Permitted uses were described as single-family detached dwellings, accessory buildings customary to single-family use, and agriculture. Mr. Black added that people should be referred to the Animal Chapter regarding agriculture citations.

Commissioner Keane inquired about the inclusion of household pets, and whether they are presumed to be allowed unless specifically excluded. Mr. Black responded that they could be removed from the RR zones, but would be allowed in all zones unless specifically excluded. Because some of the F zones are in watershed areas, household pets are specifically addressed. A question was raised with regard to the current limit on household pets. It was determined that the current number allowed is six. Mr. Black recommended including household pets in Section 19.76, stating that household pets are a permitted use in all residential zones with the exception of the F zones, where they are conditional due to watershed.

(19:50:01) Commissioner Bowen again thought it was determined previously that home occupation included home daycare and both did not need to be listed separately. Dwelling group terminology was discussed. Mr. Black explained that a dwelling group is a group of dwellings similar to a PUD. He thought it was old-fashioned and no longer needed. It was used by the County to encourage clustering and allows attached or detached dwellings. It was agreed that dwelling group should be removed as it was not adequately defined. Mr. Black added that it is defined in 19.76, although he recommended it be removed from that section as well.

Other conditional uses would include fruit and vegetable stands (if grown on site) and golf courses. The Commission agreed to remove golf courses from the list as there is no room for them in the area. Another conditional use was residential facilities for elderly people.

Commissioner Frost commented that private homes are being converted into elderly facilities.

She noted that there is a home off of Fort Union Boulevard that has such a structure and she expressed concern about limits for that use. Mr. Black explained that if there are three people or less in a dwelling, no use permit is required as they are considered a family. With four of more people, there is a specific section in the code that addresses just that issue. It is monitored by the

6 City Attorney to ensure that there are no violations of federal or state statutes that protect people.
7 Mr. Black added that homes for the elderly and disabled are also federally protected. He agreed

Mr. Black added that homes for the elderly and disabled are also federally protected. He agreed to view with Mr. Topham residential facilities in general to see if they need to be listed since by

law, if other residential uses are allowed in the same zone, these facilities are protected.

(19:56:01) It was determined that milk production/sale should be deleted. Commissioner Bowen added that the 50% would need to be produced on the premises, which will not happen. Mr. Black felt that non-retail nurseries and greenhouses would qualify as accessory buildings and, therefore, do not need to be listed separately. Nursing home uses were discussed and described as different from residential facilities for elderly persons discussed previously. He stated that sometimes there are requests for nursing homes to be located in residential areas. They require four acres or more when new. Commissioner Bowen's preference was to see them in rural one-acre areas rather than in an R-1-10 zone. Mr. Black agreed to determine what the minimum lot size should be and report back to the Commission.

 (19:58:35) Another use was described as the keeping of pigeons as a conditional use. Mr. Black thought they would need to be listed because people keep them. Commissioner Bowen stated that they are regulated by the Health Department and should not be dealt with by the City. A question was raised as to whether pigeons would be included in the permitted number of household pets. Commissioner Armstrong commented that they are not considered household pets. Mr. Black stated that pigeons are different. There is a section of code in the Animal section that includes specific regulations for pigeons. Commissioner Armstrong suggested that pigeons be allowed in other zones where they are presently not allowed such as the RR and F zones. Mr. Black recommended a determination be made as to whether they are addressed in the Animal zone and if so, remove it as a conditional use.

(20:00:51) Mr. Black reported that the minimum size for PUDs is three acres. The next use was described as on-site fruit and vegetable packing plants. He did not think that was an issue any longer in the City as there are no remaining orchards. The consensus of the Commission was to remove the use. Mr. Black noted that private schools no longer need to be specifically listed in zones where public or quasi-public uses are allowed.

Commissioner Armstrong asked if the Commission has the right to allow a use not specifically listed under conditional uses. Mr. Black responded that that they do not. If items are not included in the list of conditional uses, they are not allowed at all. Mr. Black explained, however, that there are other items listed in the supplementary and qualifying regulations that allow for uses that are not specifically listed. Commissioner Armstrong stated that they should, therefore, use care when deleting items under the conditional use category. Mr. Black stated that there have been some issues where conditional uses are too broad. Those who buy properties should have a reasonable expectation as to what they can expect to find in the neighborhood. Commissioner Bowen mentioned that there was a previous issue with a car wash. Mr. Black

explained that the City wanted to tailor the regulations at that point because they were dealing specifically with a car wash. Chair Nicholl suggested there be motivation for people who want to annex into the City. He stated that there are areas immediately adjacent to the City boundaries that could fulfill some of the regulations mentioned. It was clarified that conditional uses are basically permitted uses with conditions. The preference was to be overly restrictive and expand as a need is overwhelmingly evidenced.

1 2

(20:05:23) Mr. Black defined the next use as private nonprofit recreation. It was suggested that this item be removed as new facilities were not anticipated. He stated that in Murray the LDS Church tore down a building that was old and made a park. He believed that something like that could fall under this category. Commissioner Keane suggested that if the use cannot be clearly defined it should be removed. Commissioner Armstrong commented that there are no churches listed in the RR-1-43 zone. Mr. Black suggested they be included. If churches are listed, then nonprofit recreational grounds could be easily removed. Mr. Black clarified that churches should be allowed in every residential zone, although possibly limited by size. He further clarified that public and quasi-public uses include pump stations, schools, trailheads, parks, and charter schools. Mr. Black's opinion was that public and quasi-public uses should be allowed in all zones.

(20:09:45) The next use was identified as a radio/TV tower relay station excluding business office and studio. He was concerned that the height restrictions would be violated with this use. He thought the use would be more relevant in the F zones. Commissioner Armstrong asked if the list of towers could be consolidated where appropriate. He did not understand the difference between them. Mr. Black explained that radio and TV towers are quite large and in some ways constitute a public use. Wireless telecommunications uses are covered in a separate chapter. Radio and TV towers are usually latticed towers with four sides and resemble a ladder. He noted that some are located near I-215 and have flashing red lights at night due to their height. They are usually located at the top of a mountain. Commissioner Bowen noted that cell phone towers are needed in residential areas, however, TV towers are not necessarily needed. Mr. Black commented that many times stations have one or two towers positioned on the top of a mountain. Television towers were thought to be obsolete because of satellite and cable TV.

(20:12:34) Mr. Black noted that item 19, residential healthcare facility for 5 or 10 persons, could probably be deleted and would be researched as discussed earlier. He defined a sportsman's kennel and stated that one acre of property was required. He explained that more than three dogs could be owned. He suggested the use be modified to specify non-commercial sportsman's kennel.

The last use listed was temporary construction buildings. A question was raised as to whether the use falls under temporary use. Mr. Black suggested it simply be included in the construction section of 19.76. The consensus of the Commission was to remove the use from all sections.

(20:16:05) The RR-1-29 zone was reviewed. A typo was identified. Mr. Black explained that permitted uses would include single-family detached, accessory buildings, and agriculture. Conditional uses would include bed and breakfasts and daycare, which would be deleted.

Mr. Black assured the Commission Members that he would review the uses in each zone to ensure consistency. It was suggested that the bed and breakfast use be deleted from this zone.

The list of uses was reviewed. It was determined that PUDs will remain along with sportsman's kennels. There was discussion as to whether the one-acre minimum size requirement should remain for the kennels. The minimum lot size allows for adequate space between lots to abate smells and other nuisances. Sportsman's kennels were determined to be a rural residential use. Mr. Black suggested that for consistency, as in other issues, the one-acre minimum should perhaps be removed. Chair Nicholl thought that one-half-acre was too small and not appropriate for rural uses. Commissioner Keane thought that one-half acre made it difficult to justify rural residential concepts. Mr. Black was concerned about removing sportsman's kennels from the RR zones because it is a rural residential use. It was suggested that the one-acre minimum be removed. The consensus of the Commission was to reduce the requirement to one-half acre.

(20:22:25) Permitted uses in the RR-1-21 zone would include single-family, accessory buildings, and agriculture. Mr. Black stated that everything else would be deleted from the section. It was stated that the Despain property was re-zoned from RR to R. Mr. Black clarified that the larger portion is R-1-15. The small portion on the south end was zoned RR. It was reported that until the sale is closed on, the Despain's will not sign the zone change. It was clarified that some of the uses would not be allowed in the property located within the R zone.

(20:23:48) A Commission Member stated that he would like bed and breakfasts removed from the RR-1-21 zone. Lot size requirements were discussed. Mr. Black's opinion was that one-half acre was the limit for a bed and breakfast. Commissioner Frost thought that bed and breakfast was a default when someone has property they don't know what to do with. Commissioner Nicholl commented that it is cost-prohibitive to convert an existing home into a bed and breakfast. Mr. Black suggested leaving bed and breakfasts in the one-acre zone.

It was recognized that there is a large market and an industry of ski rentals in the community. It was his opinion that there was not enough of an industry demand for bed and breakfast uses. He was concerned that a bed and breakfast would in reality be a ski rental. He suggested they be disallowed unless someone approaches the Commission with plans showing how all of the issues have been mitigated. At that time the code can be adjusted to appropriately handle them. Commissioner Bowen added that bed and breakfasts are already allowed in the RO zone. He suggested removing them from the RR zones. Rezoning would limit future requests. The consensus of the Commission was to remove bed and breakfast from the RR zones.

(20:32:13) Mr. Black asked the Commission about daycare and preschool uses in the RR zones. The Commission suggested they be limited to home daycare uses.

Mr. Black stated that because of the proposed changes, more than one public hearing would be necessary. Notices would be published and the public given time to review the proposed changes. Giving the public adequate time with which to comment would eliminate future confusion and misunderstanding. The proposed amendments were restated and verified.

 The Commission agreed to make changes to all R-zone properties consistent with those in the R-1-15 zone. In response to question raised, Mr. Black clarified that side yard requirements vary. Accessory buildings have three-foot minimums with the exception of the F zones. He noted that

this was changed to three feet during previous discussions regarding the R-2 zones.

4 5 6

1 2

3

#### 5.2 The Planning Commission will discuss the proposed amendments to Chapter 19.76, Supplementary and Qualifying Regulations.

7 8 9

10

11

(20:52:12) Section 19.76.030 was discussed. Commissioner Bowen inquired as to the definition of a municipal zone. Mr. Black verified that it refers to the PF zone. He suggested that the name be changed to be consistent with the zoning. Mr. Black agreed to change "municipal" to "public". The word "department" was also defined.

12 13 14

15

16

17

18

Regarding item L, Mr. Black asked the Commission whether they wanted approval to be through the DRC, the Director, or the Building Official. A Commission Member commented that it is a trend that will increase and suggested there be efficiency in the decision process. Mr. Black suggested that it be one person. Commissioner Bowen recommended the hours of operation be limited to 8:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. rather than 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. He added that on item 10, the wording be "as used" for construction, rather than "as necessary" for construction.

19 20 21

22

23

Mr. Black stated that his notes per previous discussions included on-site trash receptacles, parking on the street, and to requiring on-site signage with rules listed. A Commission Member wanted it to be explicit that only licensed vehicles can be on the street and other equipment has to be on-site.

24 25 26

Commissioner Armstrong asked who will monitor the noise. Mr. Black responded that if the neighbors file a complaint, the noise will be measured. A decimeter would be used to measure noise.

28 29 30

31

32

27

Suggested modifications to item 11C were discussed. A Commission Member inquired as to whether the rules would apply to only private construction companies. It was clarified that it would apply to anyone who requires a permit. A question was raised about enforcement. Mr. Black responded that that any violation of the code is a misdemeanor with associated fines.

33 34 35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

(20:58:46) Earlier comments regarding guesthouses were discussed. Mr. Black explained that he told the Stones that they could live in a guesthouse part-time, but not full-time. Commissioner Armstrong stated that the six months the Stones spend in Arizona would constitute part-time. The issue, however, was that there will come a time when they no longer will winter in Arizona. Commissioner Keane did not view half-time occupancy as a valid a guesthouse use. To him, a guesthouse should be shorter than even a short-term rental use. He didn't believe the use proposed by the Stones had been adequately addressed. Commissioner Bowen suggested the Stones instead add on to their home. Mr. Black believed that they wanted to give relatives the main home. Mr. Black made it clear to the Stones that they could not subdivide their property.

43 44 45

46

Commissioner Keane reiterated that a "granny flat" was a separate issue. He suggested the City be very clear that a guesthouse is intended for short-term visitors, under 30 days. It was added that mother-in-law apartments are allowed so long as they are detached. Commissioner Frost was concerned about the dwelling being used after a family member dies.

(21:03:55) Chair Nicholl suggested a date be set where decisions could be made on conditional uses. He thought the first meeting in August would be reasonable. Mr. Black suggested the decision date be published and ample time given for public review. The first meeting in August was tentatively set for a decision. Commissioner Bowen asked whether such an action would create a moratorium for people coming to the Commission while the matter is under review. Mr. Black did not think that was the case and considered a moratorium to be unnecessary. He suggested the Commission identify key items for a pending ordinance. The Commission Members were asked to respond individually to a forthcoming email.

## 6. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT.

(21:09:15) There was no Planning Director's Report.

## 6.1 ADJOURNMENT.

(21:09:18) Commissioner Frost moved to adjourn. Commissioner Rosevear seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Gordon Nicholl-Aye, Geoff Armstrong-Aye, Perry Bolyard-Aye, J. Thomas Bowen-Aye, JoAnn Frost-Aye, Jerri Harwell-Aye, Doug Haymore-Aye, Jim Keane-Aye, Amy Rosevear-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

24 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 9:09 p.m.

I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the Cottonwood Heights City Planning Commission meeting held Wednesday, June 4, 2008.

Jorbes.

9 Teri Forbes

10 T Forbes Group

11 Minutes Secretary

Minutes approved: